

REMARKS

The Examiner required that the invention be restricted to one of three species. The species identified by the Examiner include a first species represented by claims 3, 6-8, 10, and 11; a second species represented by claims 4, 5, 14, and 15; and a third species represented by claims 21-25. It is noted, however, that:

"[c]laims are definitions of inventions. Claims are never species." See MPEP §806.04(e).

and

"species are preferably identified as the species of figures 1, 2, and 3 or the species of examples I, II, and III, respectively. In the absence of distinct figures or examples to identify the several species, the mechanical means, the particular material, or other distinguishing characteristic of the species should be stated for each species identified. If the species can not be conveniently identified, the claims may be grouped in accordance with the species to which they are restricted." See MPEP §809.02(a)(B).

In the present case, the Examiner did not identify the species with respect to the figures or examples set forth in applicant's specification, or set forth any reasoning why applicant's figures and examples are insufficient. As a result, the Examiner has not set forth a proper election of species requirement.

However, in an effort to further prosecution, and to satisfy the requirement that applicant must elect a single disclosed species, applicant elects the species illustrated in FIGS. 1A-1B, and believes that claims 3-8, 11, 14, 15, 21-23, and 25 read on the embodiment shown in FIGS. 1A-1B. Thus, claims 3-8, 11, 14, 15, and 21-25 are pending in this case, claim 24 has been withdrawn, and claims 1-2, 9, 12-13, and 16-20 have been cancelled.

Applicant requests the Examiner to indicate whether FIGS. 1A-1D, 2A-2D, 3A-3E, 4, 5, and 6 of the substitute formal drawings filed on August 15, 2003 (and

received by the PTO on August 18, 2003) have been entered into the application. Applicant notes that in the next communication following receipt of the drawings, applicant is to be notified by the Examiner if the drawings have been entered and, if not entered, applicant should receive an explanation as to why the drawings were not entered. (See MPEP §608.02(h).)

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4-8-05

By: Mark C. Pickering

Mark C. Pickering  
Registration No. 36,239  
Attorney for Assignee

P.O. Box 300  
Petaluma, CA 94953-0300  
Telephone: (707) 762-5500  
Facsimile: (707) 762-5504  
Customer No. 33402